An Estimate And Impact Of Perceived Performance In Institutes Of Higher Education

Dr.G.Venkat Rao*

K.V.S.Patnaik**

Key Words:

1. Perceived
2. Performance Job
3. Individuality
4. Job Satisfaction
5. Discipline

Abstract

Perceived Performance is work experience as perceived by the individual and is a subjective term. The perception of fairness in evaluation depends on the attitude on performance evaluation. The Perceived Performance may be an indicator of motivational level, confidence and morale in any Organization.

The study focuses on factors Job, Guidance and Counseling, Planning and Execution, Individuality and Discipline of Perceived Performance and its relation with profile and employment factors and Job Satisfaction. The study includes faculty from five Institutes of Higher Education in Visakhapatnam.

The factor and regression analysis predict Perceived Performance as moderate, intertwined positively with its factors and Individuality is not impacted by any factors of Perceived Performance. The strength of Job Satisfaction is low and is impacted by the factors of Perceived Performance. Perceived Performance is an important measure of determinants of employee behavior.

INTRODUCTION

HRM strategy focuses on alignment that integrates human resources policies and practices towards improving performance. Whereas vertical alignment is externally focused and horizontal alignment is internally focused (Arthur, 1992).The resource based strategy approach focus on building competencies and motivation to enhance performance (Boxall, 2007).

Organization's exists for business excellence, satisfaction and goal attainment. Performance is both qualitative and quantitative term and a measure to rate individual, group and organization. The expectancy theories were built around the notion of fit between perceived outcome and desired outcome. The behavioral aspects are influenced by what is justified based on our assumption. The satisfaction is internal to the self and depends on the perception. Therefore, the perceived performance is internal.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Perceived Performance is an experience of work as perceived by the individual and is a subjective term. And Perceived Performance is subjective, an outcome of one's

*Assistant Professor, Department of HRM, Dr.L.Bullayya P.G. College, Visakhapatnam, and can be reached at gvr101@rediff.com

**Director(Research),CollegeofManagementStudies, Dr.L.Bullayya P.G.college and can be reached at venkypat99@gmail.com

perception and has strategic value (Jackson and Schuler, 1995). The competence is the behavioral result of conceptions, personal capabilities, motivation, personality, and attitudinal factors (McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). The evaluation of performance through appraisal is negative (Meyer et al., 1965, Cleveland et all's, 1995). The evaluative-development function served by performance appraisal was explained by Ostroff (1993) as evaluative performance and is for administrative purpose and perceived performance is for individual development.

Miceli, Jung, Near, & Greenberger, (1991) say's the performance-reward dichotomy influence the reaction to evaluation, if the dichotomy is weak the perceived outcome will be negative and otherwise positive. The perception of fairness in evaluation depends on the attitude on performance evaluation. Greenberg (1990) concluded that fairness is procedural and this fairness is expected to influence the perception on performance.

Human Resources Management practices influence the performance of employees and according to Shahzad et al., (2008) the phase of development is a determining factor for employee performance. Anakwe (2002) suggests that human resource practices in developing countries have also been traditional and performance is the criteria, but how to measure performance is not answered. But, Aguinis (2009)dealt on the behavioral aspects in the definition of performance.

The perceived performance relates with expectancy–reward theory and perceives certain level of

outcome for his performance. The behavioral perception of performance is given prominence in the expectancy-reward theory. Perceived employee performance is the overall belief of the employee about his behavior and contributions in the success of organization.

Carlson et al. (2006) proposed five human resource management practices that affect performance viz., setting competitive compensation level, training and development, performance appraisal, recruitment package, and maintaining morale. Delaney & Huselid, (1996) feel that human resource management systems are associated with superior performance.

The performance management according to Halachmi, (2005) is much more than performance appraisal. The appraisal is systematic measurement whereas performance management is more than measurement. However, Teseema and Soeters, (2006) find a relation between performance evaluation and perceived employee performance and further conclude that promotion practices influence the performance. The concept of organizational justice is the perception of fairness at the workplace and Greenberg (1987) felt that work performance and job satisfaction are related with the perception on fairness. The work performance is defined by Suliman, (2007) as the degree of performance of employee to carry out job in a work setting. The theory to understand the concept of fairness as perceived in the organization (Greenberg, 2001) and it influence the work performance as perceived by the employees. Leung and Stephan (2001)have carried the concept further to include cross-cultural environment. The performance can be a perceptual measure of individual performance or organizational performance.

Thus the term perceived performance is understood as a perception of work experience and evaluation of own performance at work.

Empirical Evidence

The role orientation predicted performance more strongly than other work attitudes, including job satisfaction, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and job aspiration. (Sharon K.Parker, 2007). The organizational background variables such as age, size and turnover serve as important factors in analyzing the impact of strategic human resource management on human resources practices, performance and climate (Padmaja Palekar (2007).

The role ambivalence is viewed as impediments of performance in universities and it is both problematic and challenging (Celio AA Sousa, Willem F de Nijs, Paul HJ Hendricks, 2010). The problem in university academics is

the adverse conditions of managerial functioning and it is underestimated. There is a significant relationship between role clarity, perceived planned job change and perceived work place support on perceived job performance (Sushmita Srinivasan, 2011). The absence of perceived workplace support has a substantial negative impact on perceived performance.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The above review of empirical studies and literature draws the significance in understanding the perceived performance as a tool in understanding the behavior of employees. The components of the Perceived Performance and their impact need to be assessed. Further the impact of Performance on other behavior variable is to be analyzed. In view of its importance the Performance Perceived Performance on Job Satisfaction is selected as criteria and area for study are Institutes of Higher Education which is categorized as service sector.

The research is conducted with the following objectives. (1.) To identify the influencing factors of Perceived Performance and its relationship with profile factors and (2.) To study the impact of Perceived Performance on Job Satisfaction.

HYPOTHESIS

H1: The perceived performance is intertwined positively with its factors.

H2: With the Institutes of Higher Education as a unit, positive perceived performance prevails as perceived by faculty members.

H3: There exist a positive linkage between the Perceived Performance and Job Satisfaction.

Methodology:

The present study is done to evaluate the perceived performance in educational institutes. The perceived performance is considered as comprehensive and includes discipline, performance on the job, guidance and counseling for performance, individuality means accomplishing work without dependence and planning and execution of the job on time. Therefore for the purpose of this study, the factors were conceptualized as follows.

Discipline: The term discipline is conceptualized to mean the ability to adhere to the terms and conditions of service. The time sense, punctuality is also included.

Job: The group of tasks and positions together form a job. For accomplishing the tasks effectively, knowledge about the job is essential.

Guidance and Counseling: The term guidance and

counseling refers to the ability of the person to guide and make one to one conservation with the subordinates to overcome work related problems.

Individuality: The work requires certain level of independence as well as dependence, the individuality refers to the ability to accomplish task with least dependence on others and dependability for work i.e. the work is interrelated with other work.

Planning and Execution: Planning is a conceptual skill required to direct future course of action. Whereas execution means the ability perform the work according to the stated plan.

The study is conducted in five Institutions of Higher Education offering management, sciences and humanities courses and was affiliated within the framework of University Grants Commission rules and regulations to Andhra University in Visakhapatnam. The criteria for inclusion are 1) 5 years of existence 2) Institutes offering Post graduate education or Master level courses. The sample of 150 is selected from faculty members using convenience sampling from the universe of five Institutes located in Visakhapatnam. The instrument framed for data collection has 5 factors for Perceived Performance with 12 criteria on i) Job ii) Guidance and Counseling iii) Planning and Execution iv) Individuality v) Discipline. The Job Satisfaction was estimated with a single comprehensive criterion. The profile and employment factors considered in the study were Age, Gender, Nativity, Service, Salary and Promotion.

The analysis was done by applying factor analysis, multiple regression and descriptive statistics. Further, Mean analysis was done by applying the criteria a) Less than 2: Poor b) More than 2 to below 3: Low c) More than 3 to below 4: Moderate d) Between 4 to 5: High.

Results and Discussion:

The data is tested for its reliability using Cronbach's Alpha reliability test (Table 1) and the coefficients for profile variables, perceived performance variables, and total variables are 0.738, 0.803 and 0.765 respectively. The Correlation matrix (Table 12 at the end) between the Personal and Employment factors, Perceived Performance and Job Satisfaction has diagonal unity.

A. Profile Analysis

The age-gender gap between male and female employment is high (Table 2) with female dominance (58 per cent female, 42 per cent male, mean age x: 30years). The localization factor is even with the non-localization factor. The educational qualification with research degrees

is low (mean x: 2.1).

In educational institutes, among the faculty 42.0 per cent are engaged in teaching, 2.0 per cent in Laboratory, 6.7 per cent in teaching and administration, 44.0 per cent in teaching and laboratory and 5.3 per cent in all the above mentioned activities. Based on specialization, the distribution is computer science (28.7 per cent), Management Studies (34.0 per cent), Science (25.3 per cent), Other Courses (12.0 per cent) and standard deviation is 0.85. Further the designation wise distribution is Lecturers (34.0 per cent), Assistant Professors (52.0 per cent), Associated Professors (8.00 per cent), Professors(4.7 per cent) , Lab Incharges(1.3 per cent) and standard deviation is 0.89. The average length of service is less than 5 years (mean X: 4.8years). The salary levels are low (X: 1.90) and promotion effected are less than 2 for the sample.

B.Perceived Performance Analysis

The Perceived Performance is tested with factor analysis for factor stability. The KMO Measure (0.746) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Table 3) were significant, suggesting adequacy of data to apply factor analysis. The Communalities(Table 4) were extracted by applying Principal component Analysis with Initial value as 1.Further, only initial Eigen value of 1 or above are considered, the total variance(Table 5) was explained by one factor with 51 per cent explanation for variance (the required adequacy is 60 per cent). The component loadings (Table 6) varied from 0.287 to 0.876. The factor Individuality has a lower loading with 0.287.

The perception of the respondents (Table 7) on their discipline as good or above is high (74.67 per cent). A sizable (11.33 percent) number of respondents have rated their perceived performance on discipline as average or below. The mean of Discipline(X: 3.55) is moderate and a majority (89 per cent) of them is punctual to duty. Their job knowledge is rated as good by a majority (54.0 percent) of the respondents. Being educational institutes, the mean (X: 3.38) on Job is reasonable and moderate. The general perception on their Planning and Execution activities is good (74.14 per cent). But, 17.06 per cent feel they are average or below average. The overall mean is 3.32. Further, 29.3 per cent has expressed themselves as average or below in foreseeing problems. Further, 14 per cent rated themselves as Outstanding in planning work. Majority of the responses are in the range of average to outstanding. There is perfection in planning work (x: 3.50). Surprisingly, 27.3 per cent were average in foreseeing problems. The results suggest that overall positive impact of the factor on

perceived performance. The respondents rated their ability in providing guidance and counseling to subordinates as moderate(x: 3.20). Majority (40.0 per cent) of the respondents has rated themselves as good and 4.7 per cent rated them as below average. Whereas 16.7 per cent rated themselves as average. The mean of 2.84 for Individuality is low compared to other factors. Dependence on others is rated as average (31.3 per cent) to good (31.3 per cent) in majority of the responses.

The inter-dimensional analysis for extent of relationship between the factors of Perceived Performance is done with regression analysis. The regression equation $Y = a + bX1 + cX2 + dX3 + eX4 + u$ is applied to construct the fit model to understand the relationship. Where Y = dependent variable i.e. one of the factors of perceived performance and Xi is independent variable where $i = 1,2,3$ and 4 ; a,b,c,d,e and f are constants and u is the error term. The significant statistics of regression are mentioned in the table 8.

The Job is regressed on the other perceived performance variables. The F-test for the model is significant and explanatory power of the variables R2 is .487 i.e. 48.7 per cent explanation is provided by the independent variables. The Guidance and Counseling as a dependent variable is found to be positively influenced by Planning and Execution. The F-test is significant and the explanation accounts for 27.8 per cent only (R2: .278). The Planning and Execution and Discipline were found to be positively Influencing the dependent variable Job. The F-test was significant when Planning and Execution as dependent variable is regressed on the other independent variables of Perceived Performance. The variable explained 55.8 per cent of the dependence (R2 : .558). The independent variables Discipline, Guidance and Counseling and Job are positively influencing the dependent variable.

The Discipline as dependent variable is regressed on the other Perceived Performance variables in the next step. Nearly, 42.8 per cent of the explanation is provided by the independent variables (R2: .428). Further, Job and Planning and Execution were found as positively influencing Discipline and also they are significant.

Lastly, the Individuality as dependent variable is regressed on other Perceived Performance variables. The R2 is .008 and further, no variable was found to influencing the dependent variable. In the next phase, Perceived Performance as dependent variable is regressed with Personal and employment factors (Table 9). The F-test was significant and the model is fit for explanation. The R2:0.030 is low. The Beta value for Age and Nativity are significant and negative, and for Gender and Promotion are

significant at 10 per cent. The Age and Nativity were negatively influencing the dependent variable. However, none of the t-values are significant.

C.Job Satisfaction

The Job Satisfaction of the faculty is calculated with a criterion and the mean for the sample is low with 2.560 (Std. Deviation: 0.728). The Job Satisfaction score in the Educational Institutes is regressed on the profile factors(Table 10). The F- test is significant and the explanatory power of the equation R2 is 0.015.The constant value is 2.589. The analysis show Age, Nativity, Promotion and Service as negatively influencing the Job Satisfaction, but the Beta value of Nativity,Gender,Service,Promotion and Salary are significant. However, none of the t-values are significant.

The interlink age between the Job Satisfaction and Perceived Performance is examined by running the regression, Job Satisfaction as dependent variable is regressed on the factors of Perceived Performance as independent variable(Table 11). The constant value is 1.137 and Beta value of Discipline is significant at 5 per cent level. But, for t-values Job(10 per cent) and Individuality(5 per cent) are significant. The F-test for the model is significant and R2 is low with an explanatory power of 11.2 percent. However, Discipline and Guidance &Counseling were negatively influencing the dependent variable.

When Perceived Performance factor one at a time is regressed on other Perceived Performance factors the trend show Planning and Execution as influencing Job, Discipline and Guidance and Counseling, further Discipline is impacting Job and Planning and Execution.

The personal and employment factors viz. Age, Nativity, Gender and Promotion are influencing the Perceived Performance significantly. However, Age and Nativity are negatively related with Perceived Performance. The Profile factor influence on Perceived performance is low.

The impact of Perceived Performance factors on Job Satisfaction show that only two factors of Perceived Performance i.e., Job and Individuality are significantly and positively affecting. Further, Perceived Performance and Job Satisfaction are related and influencing positively. However, based on Beta significance Discipline is negatively impacting Job Satisfaction.

First Hypothesis:

The Perceived Performance is intertwined positively with its factors. The dependent factor Individuality is not impacted by any factors of Perceived Performance. Therefore, Individuality exhibited in the work process is considered as

direct attribute to Perceived Performance. Further, high degree of Individuality is against the principle of team work.

Second Hypothesis:

With the Institutes of Higher Education as a unit, positive Perceived Performance prevails as perceived by faculty members. The strength of the Perceived Performance is moderate, Discipline is an important contributing factor followed by Job, Planning and Execution, Guidance and Counseling and Individuality in order. All the factors are positively related with Perceived Performance. Hence, the second hypothesis is true.

Third Hypothesis:

There exist a positive linkage between the Perceived Performance and Job Satisfaction. The Perceived Performance factors except Guidance and Counseling are significantly influencing the Job Satisfaction, however, the strength of the impact on Job Satisfaction is low. The factors of Perceived Performance namely Discipline and Guidance and Counseling are showing reverse trends.

Implication of the Study:

The study invariably concludes that the perceived performance is an internal matter of satisfaction within the individual regarding their own perception of performance and is an accurate measurement of his inherent assessment. The state of perceived performance is linked with job satisfaction. The Organizations may utilize this metric to judge the level of motivation in the individual.

CONCLUSION

The Perceived Performance influences the Job Satisfaction. The factors of Perceived Performance viz. Job and Discipline are the important factors which increase or decrease the Job Satisfaction. In Educational Institutes, Individuality is important but it is not an impacting force for other variables of the Perceived Performance. Therefore, team building exercises are to be implemented.The Guidance and Counseling factor requires attention to improve Job Satisfaction. The Personal and Employment factors require special attention, the study makes outSalary is not a major important impacting factor. But, the length of service is very low and promotional avenues are negligible. The first hypothesis is proved and the other two hypotheses are true.

In Institutes of Higher Education, Perceived Performance is expected to be high but the study show it as moderate. Therefore, some more studies may be conducted in reputed Government Institutes of higher education to ascertain its impact and influence. The Perceived Performance may be an indicator of motivational level, confidence and morale in any Organization

REFERENCES

Agulnis, H. (2009).Performance Management(2nd ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Anakwe, U.P. (2002). Human resource management practices in Nigeria: Challenges and insights. International Journal Human Resources Management, 3(7),1042-59.

Arthur, J. B. (1992).The link between business strategy and industrial relations systems in American steel mini-mills. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 45,488-506.

Balkin, D. B., & Gomez-Mejia, L.R. (1987).Toward a contingency theory of compensation strategy. Strategic Management Journal, 8,169-182.

Boxall, P., Purcell, J., & Wright, P. (2007).The goals of HRM, Hand book of Human Resource Management. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carlson, D.S., Upton, N., Seaman, S. (2006).The Impact of Human Resource Practices and Compensation Design on Performance: An Analysis of Family - Owned SMEs.Journal of Small Business Management, 44(4), 531- 543.

management in university research organizations.Human Relations, 63(9), 1439-1460.

Cleveland, J. N., Murphy, K. R., & Williams, R. E. (1989).Multiple uses of performance appraisal: Prevalence and correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,130-135.

Delaney, J.T., & Huselid, M.A. (1996).The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of performance in for profit and non-profit organizations.Academy of Management Journal, 39, 949-969.

Greenberg, J. (1987).A taxonomy of organizational justice theories.Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9-22.

Greenberg, J. (1990).Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16,399-432.

Greenberg, J. (2001).The seven loose can (n) ons of organizational justice. In Greenberg, J. and Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), Advances in Organizational Justice(pp.245-271).Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Halachmi, A. (2005).Performance measurement is only one way of managing performance. International Journal of Production Performance Management, 54, 502-516.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001).Educational administration: Theory, research & practice (6th ed.).New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1995).Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environments. Annual Review of Psychology, 46, 237–264.

Khurram Shahzad, Sajid Bashir and Muhammad I Ramay (2008).Impact of HR Practices on Perceived Performance ofUniversity Teachers in Pakistan.International Review of Business Research Papers, 4(2) March, 302-315.

Leung, K., & Stephan, W. G. (2001).Social justice from a cultural perspective. In Matsumoto, D. (Ed.),The handbook of culture

and psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer et al., (1965).HRM practices and organizational commitment: Test of a mediation model. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17(4), 319-331.

Miceli,M.P., Jung, I., Near, J. P., &Greenberger, D. B. (1991).Predictors and outcomes of reactions to pay-for-performance plans. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 508-521.

Ostroff, C. (1992).The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis.Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 963-974.

Padmaja Palekar (2007).Strategic Human Resource Management– An Indian Perspective.IIMB Management Review, September, 19(3).

SharonK.Parker(2007).That is my Job' How employees' role orientation affects their job performance.Human Relations, March,60(3), 403-434

Suliman, A. M. T. (2007).Links between justice, satisfaction and performance in the workplace: A survey in the UAE and Arabic

context.Journal of Management Development, 26(4),294-311.

Sushmita Srivastava (2011).A Study of the Impact of Types of Job change On Perceived Performance of newly Rotated Managers: The Mediating Role of Job Change Dimensions. Management and Labor Studies, February, 36(1), 73-98.

Tessema, M., and Soeters, J. (2006).Challenges and prospects of HRM in developing countries: testing the HRM-performance link in Eritrean civil service. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17(1), 86-105.

Wright, P.M., McMahan, & McWilliams (1994).Human Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A resource based perspective. International Journal of HRM, 5, 304-326.

Celio A. A. Sousa, Willem F. de Nijs, Paul H.J. Hendriks (2010). Secrets of the beehive: Performance

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha

Sector	Reliability Coefficients					
	Profile&Employment Variable		Perceived Performance Variables		Total Variables (Including Job Satisfaction)	
	No.ofItem	Alpha	No. ofItems	Alpha	No. of Items	Alpha
Educational Institutes	6	.7382	12	.8026	19	.7653

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean		Std. Deviation
Age	1.69	28.16years	.76
Gender	1.58	Female Dominant (58 per cent)	.50
Nativity	1.51	Non-Local (51.3Per cent)	.50
Promotions	.91	-	.93
Salary	1.90	-	.82
Service	1.53	3.82 years	.81

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.746
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	209.382
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Table 4: Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Job	1.000	.684
Planning& Execution	1.000	.767
Discipline	1.000	.611
Individuality	1.000	8.223E-02
Guidance& Counseling	1.000	.410

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 5: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.555	51.091	51.091	2.555	51.091	51.091
2	.953	19.056	70.147			
3	.777	15.543	85.690			
4	.395	7.895	93.585			
5	.321	6.415	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6: Component Matrix

	Component
	1
Job	.827
Planning & Execution	.876
Discipline	.782
Individuality	.287
Guidance & Counseling	.641

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.a 1 component extracted.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Performance Factors

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	Per cent		Overall
1.Discipline	3.55	.7489	71.1	Moderate	
2.Job	3.38	.6833	67.6	Moderate	
3.Planningand Execution	3.32	.6078	66.4	Moderate	3.258
4.Guidanceand Counseling	3.20	.9624	64	Moderate	Moderate
5.Individuality	2.84	.7924	56.8	Low	

Table 8: Inter-Dimension Analysis of Perceived Performance Factors

Dependent Perceived performance variable	Independent Perceived performance Variable Which is Significant	R^2	t Value
1 Job	1.Planning and Execution 2. Discipline	.487	5.010* 4.761*
2 Guidance and Counseling	1.Planning and Execution	.278	5.329*
3. Planning and Execution	1.Discipline 2. Guidance and Counseling 3.Job	.558	3.946* 5.329* 5.010*
4. Discipline	1.Job 2. Planningand Execution	.428	4.761* 3.946*
5. Individuality	Nil	.008	

Significance Levels   *: 1%   **: 5%   ***: 10%

Table 9: Standardized Beta Coefficients

Model		Standardized Coefficients Beta
1	(Constant)	1.3217
	Age	-.046***
	Gender	.072***
	Nativity	-.024**
	Service	.121
	Promotions	.061***
	Salary	.110

a Dependent Variable: Perceived Performance

Table 10: Standardized Beta Coefficents

Model		Standardized Coefficients Beta
1	(Constant)	1.781
	AGE	-.116
	Gender	.046
	Nativity	-.003
	Service	-.027
	Promotions	-.033
	Salary	.072

a Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 11: Standardized Beta Coefficients

Model		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.137	3.026	.003
	Job	.194	1.774	.078
	Planning & Execution	.157	1.331	.185
	Discipline	-.024**	-.227	.821
	Individuality	.167	2.087	.039
	Guidance & Counseling	-.107	-1.156	.249

a Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 12 : Correlation Matrix

	Age	Gender	Nativity	Promotion	Salary	Service	Job Satisfaction	Planning & Execution	Discipline	Individuality	Guidance & Counseling	Job
Age	1.000											
Gender	-.166*	1.000										
Nativity	.081	.063	1.000									
Promotion	.691*	-.312*	.096	1.000								
Salary	.643*	-.270*	.126	.745*	1.000							
Service	.658*	-.282*	.090	.728*	.680*	1.000						
Job Satisfaction	-.106	.086	.050	-.110	-.040	-.177*	1.000					
Planning & Execution	-.052	.064	-.038	-.029	.021	-.068	.213*	1.000				
Discipline	.023	.142***	-.064	-.017	-.002	.014	.162**	.579*	1.000			
Individuality	.003	-.049	-.016	.140***	.022	.051	.153***	.170**	.141***	1.000		
Guidance &Counseling	.140***	-.104	.064	.161**	.213*	.114	.061	.521*	.269*	.134	1.000	.
Job	.004	.027	.004	.006	.052	-.013	.293*	.637*	.599*	.122	.351*	1.000

Significant: *   1percent ,**   5percent, *** 10 percent levels.